

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 12, 15, 16, 22, and 24 have been amended and new claim 28 has been added. Claims 1-11, 13, 17-21, and 23 were previously canceled. Claims 12, 14-16, 22, and 24-28 are pending, with claims 12 and 22 being independent. Claims 12, 14-16, 22, and 24-27 are under consideration. No new matter is presented in this amendment.

Claims 12, 15, and 16 have been amended solely to improve their form and correct informalities in claim 12. No new limitations have been added to these claims, such that the Examiner cannot make the next Office Action final if it includes a new ground of rejection of any of these claims.

Request for Acceptance of Replacement Drawings Filed on September 29, 2005

Three replacement sheets of drawings were filed with the amendment of September 29, 2005, but the Office Action of December 15, 2005, does not indicate whether the replacement sheets of drawings have been accepted. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner accept the replacement sheets of drawings in the next Office Action.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 12 has been amended to correct these informalities and to improve its form, and it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 12, 15, 16, and 26

Claims 12, 15, 16 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (Lee) (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,252). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lee does not disclose "high-density source and drain regions formed at the end portions of said semiconductor layer exposed beyond said spacers, the high-density source and drain

regions being spaced apart from the gate electrode and the capping layer" and "low-density source and drain regions having a same conductivity as said high-density source and drain regions formed at regions of said semiconductor layer under said spacers between the gate electrode and the high-density source and drain regions" as recited in independent claim 12 as alleged by the Examiner because in Figs. 5A-5B of Lee, second regions 92 formed at the end portions of the semiconductor layer are low-density source and drain regions, rather than high-density source and drain regions, and first regions 90 formed under the spacers formed by the vertical walls of protection film 80 are high-density source and drain regions, rather than low-density source and drain regions. See column 7, lines 20-22, of Lee which states that "the second regions 92 have a lower doped density than the first region 90."

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 and claims 15, 16, and 26 depending therefrom under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 12 and 14

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (Chang) (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0153527) in view of Yamazaki et al. '288 (Yamazaki '288) (U.S. Patent No. 5,568,288). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The effective U.S. filing date of Chang is April 30, 2001, which is after the filing date of March 2, 2001, of Korean Application No. 2001-10842, the Korean priority application of the present application. A certified copy of the Korean priority application was submitted on March 7, 2002, and receipt of the certified copy was acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action of December 4, 2002.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55(a)(4) and MPEP 201.15, submitted herewith are an English translation of Korean Application No. 2001-10842 and a statement that the English translation is accurate to perfect the applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d) and remove the availability of Chang as a reference against the claims of the present application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 12 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Yamazaki '288 be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 24, 25, and 27

Claims 22, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda et al. (Yoneda) (U.S. Patent No. 5,837,568) in view of Lee, and claim 25 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda in view of Lee as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. '502 (Yamazaki '502) (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0207502). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yoneda does not disclose or suggest "high-density source and drain regions formed at entireties of the end portions of said semiconductor layer exposed beyond said spacers" as now recited in independent claim 22 because Figs. 12E-12J and 13 of Yoneda relied on by the Examiner show that high-density source and drain regions 11S and 11D are formed only at portions of the end portions of semiconductor layer 11 exposed beyond spacers 15, rather than at entireties of the end portions of semiconductor layer 11 exposed beyond spacers 15, because portions of low-density source and drain regions 11L are also formed at portions of the end portions of semiconductor layer 11 exposed beyond spacers 15.

Also, Yoneda does not disclose or suggest "low-density source and drain regions having a same conductivity as said high-density source and drain regions formed at entireties of off-set regions of said semiconductor layer entirely under said spacers, thereby providing said semiconductor layer with lightly doped drain (LDD) regions entirely under said spacers" as now recited in independent claim 22 because Figs. 12E-12J and 13 of Yoneda relied on by the Examiner show that low-density source and drain regions 11L are formed at portions of off-set regions of semiconductor layer 11 partially under spacers 15 and at portions of the end portions of semiconductor layer 11 exposed beyond spacers 15, and thus provide semiconductor layer 11 with lightly doped drain (LDD) regions partially under spacers 15.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 22 and claims 24, 25, and 27 depending therefrom under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Yoneda, Lee, and Yamazaki et al. '502 be withdrawn.

New Claim 28

New claim 28 depends from claim 12, and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above that claim 12 is patentable.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this paper, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 04/14/06

By: 
Randall S. Svihla
Registration No. 56,273

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510